



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/686,877	10/16/2003	George Hage	HITRON.004A	7385
7590 05/14/2008 GAZDZINSKI & ASSOCIATES Suite 375 11440 West Bernardo Court San Diego, CA 92127				
EXAMINER WONG, ALLEN C				
ART UNIT 2621		PAPER NUMBER		
MAIL DATE 05/14/2008		DELIVERY MODE PAPER		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

### Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/686,877

**Applicant(s)**

HAGE, GEORGE

**Examiner**

Allen Wong

**Art Unit**

2621

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 January 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3,5-12, 14-20, 23, 24 and 27-37 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3,5-12, 14-20, 23, 24 and 27-37 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 16 October 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsman's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Response to Arguments***

1. Applicant's arguments filed 1/17/08 have been fully read and considered but they are not persuasive.

The 112 rejection is withdrawn.

Regarding lines 24-27 on page 8 of applicant's remarks, applicant asserts that Ramirez-Diaz does not disclose that the reduction of visual clarity is an unintentional artifact of the act of resizing and is neither a desired effect nor intentional. The examiner respectfully disagrees. In column 6, line 55 to column 7, line 6, Ramirez-Diaz's figure 2 discloses the resizing of image data when displaying image data, and also permits the user to adjust the settings of the camera to affect the video motion detection sensitivity, video brightness and contrast, as well as the image area of surveillance for permitting intentional influencing of the reduction of visual clarity of the obtained data when the data is displayed on screen for viewing, thus the visual clarity of the second data is reduced. Thus, Ramirez-Diaz discloses that since the user can purposely or intentionally adjust the data displayed, it is clear Ramirez-Diaz teaches intentional reduction of the visual clarity of data. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Hart and Ramirez-Diaz, as a whole, for remote monitoring of surveillance image data implemented on industrial, medical, remote and home applications, as suggested in Ramirez-Diaz's column 3, lines 49-52.

1. Regarding lines 28-29 on page 8 of applicant's remarks, applicant states Hart teaches away from the combination with Ramirez-Diaz. The examiner respectfully disagrees. In response to applicant's argument that Hart teaches away from combination with Ramirez-Diaz, the test for obviousness is not whether the features of a secondary reference may be bodily incorporated into the structure of the primary reference; nor is it that the claimed invention must be expressly suggested in any one or all of the references. Rather, the test is what the combined teachings of the references would have suggested to those of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981).

One cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

Regarding lines 1-4 on page 9 of applicant's remarks, applicant states that the combination lacks the requisite suggestion or motivation, unintended byproduct of Ramirez. The examiner respectfully disagrees. In column 6, line 55 to column 7, line 6, Ramirez-Diaz's figure 2 discloses the resizing of image data when displaying image data, and also permits the user to adjust the settings of the camera to affect the video motion detection sensitivity, video brightness and contrast, as well as the image area of surveillance for permitting intentional influencing of the reduction of visual clarity of the obtained data when the data is displayed on screen for viewing, thus the visual clarity of the second data is reduced. Thus, Ramirez-Diaz discloses that since the user can

purposely or intentionally adjust the data displayed, it is clear Ramirez-Diaz teaches intentional reduction of the visual clarity of data. The examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Hart and Ramirez-Diaz, as a whole, for remote monitoring of surveillance image data implemented on industrial, medical, remote and home applications, as suggested in Ramirez-Diaz's column 3, lines 49-52.

Regarding lines 19-25 on page 9 of applicant's remarks, applicant states that Ramirez-Diaz does not remotely recognizes the problem identified: maintaining privacy and/or anonymity. The examiner respectfully disagrees. In column 4, lines 28-32, Ramirez-Diaz discloses that when the alarm is triggered, the user can be informed by any appropriate communication means, and in column 4, line 52, Ramirez-Diaz also discloses the possibility of using "dedicated lines" for informing the user of the alarm condition through a private, dedicated line to maintain privacy and anonymity of the data transmitted to the user to ensure the authenticity of the transmitted alarm data. The test for obviousness is not whether the features of a secondary reference may be bodily incorporated into the structure of the primary reference; nor is it that the claimed invention must be expressly suggested in any one or all of the references. Rather, the

Art Unit: 2621

test is what the combined teachings of the references would have suggested to those of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981).

One cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

The examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Hart and Ramirez-Diaz, as a whole, for remote monitoring of surveillance image data implemented on industrial, medical, remote and home applications, as suggested in Ramirez-Diaz's column 3, lines 49-52.

Regarding line 31 on page 9 to line 3 on page 10, and lines 12-17 on page 10 of applicant's remarks, applicant states that Hart does not disclose covering the security sensor apparatus so as to make it a "covert" security sensor, and "passive infrared security sensor". The examiner respectfully disagrees. In column 6, lines 2-10, Hart discloses that the apparatus can be configured by using element 8 to cover the camera 22 in a covert, secretive manner to make the camera not readily discernable by people

in the location so as to blend in with the environment of the monitored location and to prevent the discovery of the camera 22, wherein the PIR 12 of fig.3 are passive infrared security sensors with multiple PIR circuits corresponding to multiple PIR sensors. Thus, Hart discloses covering the security sensor apparatus so as to make it a "covert" security sensor, and "passive infrared security sensor".

Regarding lines 21-23 and 25-26 on page 10 of applicant's remarks, applicant states that Hart does not disclose distribution of processed data to a remote location wherein the processed data allows viewing of only certain features of said monitored location or its inhabitants. In column 7, lines 59-66, Hart discloses that element 76 is used to distribute or provide data to a remote, secure location. When security or surveillance data is delivered to a user to a remote location, the data is delivered on a secured line or connection for maintaining privacy of the surveillance data during transmission to a remote location. Thus, Hart discloses distributing entity adapted to distribute the processed data to a remote location. In column 9, lines 7-17, Hart discloses that the intruder's face is obtained for viewing, thus, only certain features of the monitored location is displayed for close examination wherein said processed data allows viewing of only certain features of said monitored location or its inhabitants. Thus, Hart discloses distribution of processed data to a remote location wherein the processed data allows viewing of only certain features of said monitored location or its inhabitants.

Regarding lines 15-16 on page 11 of applicant's remarks, applicant states that Hart does not disclose processing capabilities located within the sensor assembly itself.

Art Unit: 2621

Although Hart does not specifically disclose the processing entity is located within the sensors, however, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include the processing entity within the sensor for interactively connecting with the sensors for obtaining relevant detected data of the monitored scene so as to permit processing captured raw data and permit the accurate, clear display and presentation of the monitored scene. Doing so would provide good clear surveillance of the monitored scene for detecting intruders and suspicious activity. The processing entity must be within the sensor or camera for permitting the processing of raw image data captured by the CCDs within the camera device so as to capture and process the raw image data so as to permit the transmittal of the captured monitored image data to the user as needed for informing the user of the current alarm situation at hand in security applications.

Regarding lines 29-31 on page 11, and lines 2-5 on page 12 of applicant's remarks, applicant states that neither Hart nor Ramirez-Diaz discloses a processing entity that includes a computer program having algorithms particularly adapted to alter without user intervention data for reducing resolution or content such that details of individuals being monitored by said apparatus are not discernable. The examiner respectfully disagrees. In column 6, lines 43-46, and figures 1-2, element 14, where figure 3 is the interior of element 14, Hart discloses element 52 is the processing unit that is in communication with the sensor 22 and PIR sensors 12, in that element 52 processes the first and second data. Thus, Hart discloses at least one processing entity in data communication with the sensor and adapted to process the first data to produce second data, the second data intentionally altering the first data sufficiently.



Hart does not specifically disclose comprising computer program with algorithms adapted to intentionally altering, without user intervention, said first data sufficiently that video derived therefrom is sufficiently reduced in resolution or content such that details of individuals being monitored by said apparatus are not discernable. However, in column 7, lines 18-21, the operating system can automatically react without user intervention for resizing or reducing resolution. Thus, Ramirez-Diaz teaches comprising computer program with algorithms adapted to intentionally altering, without user intervention. In column 6, line 55 to column 7, line 6, Ramirez-Diaz's figure 2 discloses the resizing of image data when displaying image data, and also, Ramirez-Diaz permits the user to adjust the settings of the camera to affect the video motion detection sensitivity, video brightness and contrast, as well as the image area of surveillance for permitting intentional influencing of the reduction of visual clarity of the obtained data when the data is displayed on screen for viewing, thus the visual clarity of the second data is reduced. Thus, Ramirez-Diaz discloses the second data intentionally altering the first data sufficiently that video derived therefrom is sufficiently reduced in resolution or content such that details of individuals being monitored by the apparatus are not discernable. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Hart and Ramirez-Diaz, as a whole, for remote monitoring of surveillance image data implemented on industrial, medical, remote and home applications, as suggested in Ramirez-Diaz's column 3, lines 49-52.

Regarding lines 10-13 on page 12 of applicant's remarks, applicant states that Hart and Ramirez-Diaz cannot be combined. The examiner respectfully disagrees. In

column 6, line 55 to column 7, line 6, Ramirez-Diaz's figure 2 discloses the resizing of image data when displaying image data, and also permits the user to adjust the settings of the camera to affect the video motion detection sensitivity, video brightness and contrast, as well as the image area of surveillance for permitting intentional influencing of the reduction of visual clarity of the obtained data when the data is displayed on screen for viewing, thus the visual clarity of the second data is reduced. Thus, Ramirez-Diaz discloses that since the user can purposely or intentionally adjust the data displayed, it is clear Ramirez-Diaz teaches intentional reduction of the visual clarity of data. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Hart and Ramirez-Diaz, as a whole, for remote monitoring of surveillance image data implemented on industrial, medical, remote and home applications, as suggested in Ramirez-Diaz's column 3, lines 49-52.

The test for obviousness is not whether the features of a secondary reference may be bodily incorporated into the structure of the primary reference; nor is it that the claimed invention must be expressly suggested in any one or all of the references. Rather, the test is what the combined teachings of the references would have suggested to those of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981).

One cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

Regarding lines 18-20 and lines 26-28 on page 12 of applicant's remarks, applicant states that Ramirez-Diaz does not involve the processing of data so as to produce first and second data, and data is unaltered at all times it is monitored. The examiner respectfully disagrees. In column 6, lines 43-46, figures 1-2, element 14, where fig.3 is the interior of element 14, Hart discloses that element 52 is the processing unit that is in communication with the sensor 22 and PIR sensors 12. Thus, Hart discloses processing first data collected by said at least one sensor using said apparatus to produce second data, said second data having at least one attribute associated therewith. Hart does not specifically disclose selectively, and responsive to a first indication, monitoring said first location using said first data. However, in column 4, lines 20-29, Ramirez-Diaz discloses that in figure 7, remote console 5a to 5n are used for viewing, via the LAN or any network means 10. Thus, Ramirez-Diaz discloses selectively, and responsive to a first indication, monitoring said first location using said first data. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Hart and Ramirez-Diaz, as a whole, for remote monitoring of surveillance image data implemented on industrial, medical, remote and home applications, as suggested in Ramirez-Diaz's column 3, lines 49-52. Also, claim 30 does not mention anything about "altered" data. Claim 30 only mentions processing data, not specifically altering data.

Regarding lines 14-16 on page 13 of applicant's remarks, applicant states that the support element disclosed is not itself adapted to transmit electrical power or information signals. The examiner respectfully disagrees. Hart does not specifically

disclose a support element adapted to support and removably mate with said sensor element, said support element comprising at least one second electrical interface adapted to transmit electrical power and information signals to and from said at least one first interface; and wherein said at least one first and second electrical interfaces are adapted for rapid separation from each other incident with said removal of said sensor element from said support element. In column 5, lines 15-22, Arbuckle discloses the support element, also see column 5, lines 4-14 and column 6, line 66 to column 7, line 5. Thus, Arbuckle teaches a support element adapted to support and removably mate with the sensor element, the support element comprising at least one second electrical interface adapted to transmit electrical power and information signals to and from the at least one first interface. In column 5, lines 4-14 and column 6, line 66 to column 7, line 5, Arbuckle discloses wherein said at least one first and second electrical interfaces are adapted for rapid separation from each other incident with said removal of said sensor element from said support element. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Hart and Arbuckle, as a whole, for protecting the vital camera components, jacks and wires while permitting ease of use and installation of cameras for monitoring locations in surveillance tasks, as suggested in Arbuckle's column 2, lines 52-59.

With respect to new claims 36 and 37, see the above analysis to claims 1 and 33 and the rejection below for explanation.

Thus, the rejection is maintained.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 12 and 14-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Hart (5,473,368).

Regarding claim 12, Hart discloses covert security sensor apparatus, comprising:

at least one camera adapted to generate video signals relating to at least one monitored location (col.6, ln.17-24, fig.1-2, element 22);

wherein said apparatus is configured to look like a passive infrared security sensor such that the presence of said at least one camera is not readily expected or discernable by inhabitants of said location, thereby providing said covertness (col.6, ln.2-10; Hart discloses that the apparatus can be configured by using element 8 to cover the camera 22 in a covert, secretive manner to make the camera not readily discernable by people in the location so as to blend in with the environment of the monitored location and to prevent the discovery of the camera 22, wherein the PIR 12 of fig.3 are passive infrared security sensors with multiple PIR circuits corresponding to multiple PIR sensors).

Regarding claim 14, Hart discloses a passive IR (PIR) sensor (col.5, ln.49-51 and fig.3, element 12 are passive IR sensors, and the PIR circuit clock 42 have multiple PIR circuits, see col.6, ln.46-48).

Regarding claim 15, Hart discloses at least one processing entity in data communication with said camera and adapted to process said video signals to produce processed video data for viewing (col.6, ln.43-46, fig.1-2, element 14, where fig.3 is the interior of element 14, and that element 52 is the processing unit that is in communication with the sensor 22 and PIR sensors 12); and at least one distribution entity adapted to distribute said processed data to a remote location (col.7, ln.59-66; element 76 is used to distribute or provide data to a remote location).

Regarding claim 16, Hart discloses at least one processing entity in data communication with said camera and adapted to process said video signals to produce processed video data for viewing (col.6, ln.43-46, fig.1-2, element 14, where fig.3 is the interior of element 14, and that element 52 is the processing unit that is in communication with the sensor 22 and PIR sensors 12), said processed video data comprising an altered representation of said signals (col.7, ln.16-21; fig.1-2, element 14, where fig.3 is the interior of element 14 for processing or altering the data).

Regarding claim 17, Hart discloses wherein said at least one processing entity comprises a digital processor with associated memory, and signal processing algorithm running thereon. (col.6, ln.43-46, fig.1-2, element 14, where fig.3 is the interior of element 14, and that element 52 is the processing unit that is in communication with the sensor 22 and PIR sensors 12).

Regarding claim 18, Hart discloses a data interface adapted to transfer at least portions of said processed video data to a remote monitoring location (col.7, ln.59-66; element 76 is used to distribute or provide data to a remote location).

Regarding claim 19, Hart discloses a housing which appears as that associated with another type of sensor (col.6, ln.2-10; Hart discloses that the apparatus can be configured by using element 8 to cover the camera 22); and providing a discrete aperture within said housing to accommodate said at least one camera (col.6, ln.2-10; Hart discloses that the apparatus can be configured by using element 8 to cover the camera 22 in a covert, secretive manner to make the camera not readily discernable by people in the location so as to blend in with the environment of the monitored location and to prevent the discovery of the camera 22).

Regarding claim 20, Hart discloses a security sensor, comprising:

at least one camera adapted to generate video data relating to at least one monitored location (col.6, ln.17-24, fig.1-2, element 22);

at least one processing entity in data communication with said camera and adapted to process said video data to produce processed video data (col.6, ln.43-46, fig.1-2, element 14, where fig.3 is the interior of element 14, and that element 52 is the processing unit that is in communication with the sensor 22 and PIR sensors 12); and

at least one distribution entity adapted to distribute said processed data to a remote location (col.7, ln.59-66; element 76 is used to distribute or provide data to a remote location), wherein said processed data allows viewing of only certain features of said monitored location or its inhabitants (col.7, ln.59-66; element 76 is used to distribute or provide data to a remote location, and col.9, ln.7-17, the intruder's face is obtained for viewing, thus, only certain features of the monitored location is displayed for close examination).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-3, 5-11, 27-32 and 34-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hart (5,473,368) in view of Ramirez-Diaz (6,476,858).

Regarding claim 1, Hart discloses a sensor assembly comprising:

at least one sensor adapted to generate first data (col.6, ln.17-24, fig.1-2, element 22); and

at least one processing entity in data communication with said sensor and adapted to process said first data to produce second data, said second data having at least one desired effect associated therewith (col.6, ln.43-46, fig.1-2, element 14, where fig.3 is the interior of element 14, and that element 52 is the processing unit that is in communication with the sensor 22 and PIR sensors 12).

Hart does not specifically disclose wherein said desired effect comprises the intentional reduction in the visual clarity of second data when said second data is displayed by apparatus adapted for viewing of said second data. However, Ramirez-Diaz teaches the reduction in visual clarity of image data when displayed (col.6, ln.55 to col.7, ln.6, fig.2, Ramirez-Diaz discloses the resizing of image data when displaying image data, and also, Ramirez-Diaz permits the user to adjust the settings of the camera to affect the video motion detection sensitivity, video brightness and contrast, as



well as the image area of surveillance for permitting intentional influencing of the reduction of visual clarity of the obtained data when the data is displayed on screen for viewing, thus the visual clarity of the second data is reduced). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Hart and Ramirez-Diaz, as a whole, for remote monitoring of surveillance image data implemented on industrial, medical, remote and home applications (Ramirez-Diaz col.3, ln.49-52).

Regarding claim 2, Hart discloses wherein the sensor comprises an optical band semiconductor camera the use of IR band sensor (note fig.3 discloses the PIR circuit clock 42 for interacting with the PIR detector 12 of fig.1; see col.6, ln.64-col.7, ln.1).

Regarding claim 3, Hart discloses wherein the sensor comprises an IR band sensor (note fig.3 discloses the PIR circuit clock 42 for interacting with the PIR sensor or detector 12 of fig.1; see col.6, ln.64-col.7, ln.1).

Regarding claim 5, Hart does not specifically disclose wherein said at least one desired effect comprises selective deletion of portions of the field of view of said at least one sensor when said second data is displayed by apparatus adapted for viewing of same. However, Ramirez-Diaz teaches the adjustment of the desired effect of selective deletion of portions of the viewing of the second data (col.7, ln.42-44, Ramirez-Diaz discloses the selection and deletion of data and col.7, ln.51-57, Ramirez-Diaz discloses that certain areas or portions of the monitored scene can be selected for focus and examination to check for motion or intrusion activity). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Hart and Ramirez-

Diaz, as a whole, for remote monitoring of surveillance image data implemented on industrial, medical, remote and home applications (Ramirez-Diaz col.3, In.49-52).

Regarding claim 6, Hart does not specifically disclose wherein said at least one desired effect comprises selective permutation of the order of portions of the field of view of said at least one sensor when said second data is displayed by apparatus adapted for viewing of same. However, Ramirez-Diaz teaches the adjustment of the desired effect of selective permutations of portions of the viewing of the second data (col.7, In.42-44, Ramirez-Diaz discloses the selection and deletion of data and col.7, In.51-57, Ramirez-Diaz discloses that certain areas or portions of the monitored scene can be selected for focus and examination to check for motion or intrusion activity; col.7, In.60-col.8, In.5, a motion detection algorithm is used to evaluate permutations of data). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Hart and Ramirez-Diaz, as a whole, for remote monitoring of surveillance image data implemented on industrial, medical, remote and home applications (Ramirez-Diaz col.3, In.49-52).

Regarding claims 7 and 9, Hart discloses further comprising a low-cost sensor housing within which at least a portion of said at least one sensor is disposed (col.6, In.2-10; Hart discloses that the apparatus can be configured by using element 8 to cover the camera 22 in a covert, secretive manner), wherein said at least one sensor comprises a low cost B/W camera (fig.1-2, element 22), and said at least one preceding entity is disposed external of said housing, such that said sensor assembly is low cost as a whole and hence disposable in nature (col.6, In.2-10; Hart discloses that the

Art Unit: 2621

apparatus can be configured by using element 8 to cover the camera 22 in a covert, secretive manner).

Regarding claim 8, Hart discloses comprising a base element adapted for mounting the housing thereto, the base element containing the at least one processing entity (col.6, ln.2-10; Hart discloses that the apparatus can be configured by using element 8 to cover the camera 22 in a covert, secretive manner to make the camera not readily discernable by people in the location so as to blend in with the environment of the monitored location and to prevent the discovery of the camera 22, where element 8 can be mounted to protect the camera from the harsh external conditions).

Regarding claim 10, Hart discloses the processing entity comprises a digital processor having an embedded memory and a plurality of computer code running thereon, the computer code being adapted to provide said processing of said first data (col.6, ln.43-46, fig.1-2, element 14, where fig.3 is the interior of element 14, and that element 52 is the processing unit that is in communication with the sensor 22 and PIR sensors 12).

Regarding claim 11, Hart discloses the use of an ADC adapted to render the first data in the digital domain (col.7, ln.3 and fig.3, element 50).

Regarding claim 27, Hart discloses high privacy sensor apparatus, comprising:  
at least one sensor adapted to generate first data (col.6, ln.17-24, fig.1-2, element 22); and

at least one processing entity in data communication with said sensor and adapted to process said first data to produce second data, said second data intentionally altering said first data sufficiently (col.6, ln.43-46, fig.1-2, element 14, where fig.3 is the interior of element 14, and that element 52 is the processing unit that is in communication with the sensor 22 and PIR sensors 12).

Hart does not specifically disclose comprising computer program with algorithms adapted to intentionally altering, without user intervention, said first data sufficiently that video derived therefrom is sufficiently reduced in resolution or content such that details of individuals being monitored by said apparatus are not discernable. However, Ramirez-Diaz teaches comprising computer program with algorithms adapted to intentionally altering, without user intervention (col.7, ln.18-21, the operating system can automatically react without user intervention for resizing or reducing resolution), the second data intentionally altering the first data sufficiently that video derived therefrom is sufficiently reduced in resolution or content such that details of individuals being monitored by the apparatus are not discernable (col.6, ln.55 to col.7, ln.6, fig.2, Ramirez-Diaz discloses the resizing of image data when displaying image data, and also, Ramirez-Diaz permits the user to adjust the settings of the camera to affect the video motion detection sensitivity, video brightness and contrast, as well as the image area of surveillance for permitting intentional influencing of the reduction of visual clarity of the obtained data when the data is displayed on screen for viewing, thus the visual clarity of the second data is reduced). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Hart and Ramirez-Diaz, as a whole,

for remote monitoring of surveillance image data implemented on industrial, medical, remote and home applications (Ramirez-Diaz col.3, ln.49-52).

Regarding claim 28, Hart discloses the face, ie. facial details, of the intruder captured on camera (col.9, ln.7-17).

Regarding claim 29, Hart does not disclose wherein said apparatus if further adapted to operate in a mode whereby said processing of said first data is altered so as to increase said resolution at least temporarily. However, Ramirez-Diaz teaches the adjustment of the desired effect of selective deletion of portions of the viewing of the second data for temporarily increasing resolution (col.7, ln.42-44, Ramirez-Diaz discloses the selection and deletion of data and col.7, ln.51-57, Ramirez-Diaz discloses that certain areas or portions of the monitored scene can be selected for focus, ie. increasing resolution, and examination to check for motion or intrusion activity). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Hart and Ramirez-Diaz, as a whole, for remote monitoring of surveillance image data implemented on industrial, medical, remote and home applications (Ramirez-Diaz col.3, ln.49-52).

Regarding claim 30, Hart discloses a method of operating security monitoring apparatus disposed at a first location, the method comprising:

providing at least one sensor having signal processing apparatus (col.6, ln.17-24, fig.1-2, element 22);

processing first data collected by said at least one sensor using said apparatus to produce second data, said second data having at least one attribute associated therewith (col.6, ln.43-46, fig.1-2, element 14, where fig.3 is the interior of element 14, and that element 52 is the processing unit that is in communication with the sensor 22 and PIR sensors 12); and

monitoring said first location using said second data (col.6, ln.17-24, fig.1-2, element 22 monitors the first location).

Hart does not specifically disclose selectively, and responsive to a first indication, monitoring said first location using said first data. However, Ramirez-Diaz discloses selectively, and responsive to a first indication, monitoring said first location using said first data (col.4, ln.20-29, fig.7, note use of remote console 5a to 5n for viewing, via the LAN or any network means 10). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Hart and Ramirez-Diaz, as a whole, for remote monitoring of surveillance image data implemented on industrial, medical, remote and home applications (Ramirez-Diaz col.3, ln.49-52).

Regarding claim 31, Hart discloses the act of monitoring is conducted at a second location (col.7, ln.59-66; element 76 is used to distribute or provide data to a remote location). Hart does not disclose said first indication comprises an alarm signal generated at least in part at said first location. However, Ramirez-Diaz teaches the alarm signal can be generated (col.4, ln.28-32). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Hart and Ramirez-Diaz, as

a whole, for remote monitoring of surveillance image data implemented on industrial, medical, remote and home applications (Ramirez-Diaz col.3, ln.49-52).

Regarding claim 32, Hart does not specifically disclose wherein said act of processing to produce second data having at least one attribute comprises processing to reducing the resolution of video generated from said second data sufficiently that the privacy of individuals disposed at said first location is maintained. However, Ramirez-Diaz teaches the reduction of resolution of video data (col.6, ln.55 to col.7, ln.6, fig.2, Ramirez-Diaz discloses the resizing of image data when displaying image data, and also, Ramirez-Diaz permits the user to adjust the settings of the camera to affect the video motion detection sensitivity, video brightness and contrast, as well as the image area of surveillance for permitting intentional influencing of the reduction of visual clarity of the obtained data when the data is displayed on screen for viewing, thus the visual clarity of the second data is reduced). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Hart and Ramirez-Diaz, as a whole, for remote monitoring of surveillance image data implemented on industrial, medical, remote and home applications (Ramirez-Diaz col.3, ln.49-52).

Regarding claim 34, Hart does not specifically disclose the reduction in visual clarity of image data when displayed. However, Ramirez-Diaz teaches the reduction in visual clarity of image data when displayed (fig.2, Ramirez-Diaz discloses the resizing of image data when displaying image data, thus the visual clarity is reduced). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Hart and Ramirez-Diaz, as a whole, for remote monitoring of surveillance image data

Art Unit: 2621

implemented on industrial, medical, remote and home applications (Ramirez-Diaz col.3, ln.49-52).

Regarding claim 35, Hart discloses a signal interface (col.6, ln.43-46, fig.1-2, element 14, where fig.3 is the interior of element 14, and that element 52 is the processing unit that is in communication with the sensor 22 and PIR sensors 12, where data signals are interfaced). Hart does not disclose wherein said system further comprises an operating mode wherein said processing of said raw data to produce said desired attribute is selectively not performed based on data transmitted over said signal interface. However, Ramirez-Diaz teaches the reduction of resolution of video data (col.6, ln.55 to col.7, ln.6, fig.2, Ramirez-Diaz discloses the resizing of image data when displaying image data, and also, Ramirez-Diaz permits the user to adjust the settings of the camera to affect the video motion detection sensitivity, video brightness and contrast, as well as the image area of surveillance for permitting intentional influencing of the reduction of visual clarity of the obtained data when the data is displayed on screen for viewing, thus the visual clarity of the second data is reduced). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Hart and Ramirez-Diaz, as a whole, for remote monitoring of surveillance image data implemented on industrial, medical, remote and home applications (Ramirez-Diaz col.3, ln.49-52).

Regarding claim 36, Hart discloses a sensor assembly comprising:

at least one sensor adapted to generate first data (col.6, ln.17-24, fig.1-2, element 22); and



at least one processing entity in data communication with said sensor and adapted to process said first data to produce second data (col.6, ln.43-46, fig.1-2, element 14, where fig.3 is the interior of element 14, and that element 52 is the processing unit that is in communication with the sensor 22 and PIR sensors 12).

Hart does not specifically disclose said second data having intentionally reduced visual clarity when said second data is displayed by apparatus adapted for viewing of said second data. However, Ramirez-Diaz teaches the reduction in visual clarity of image data when displayed (col.6, ln.55 to col.7, ln.6, fig.2, Ramirez-Diaz discloses the resizing of image data when displaying image data, and also, Ramirez-Diaz permits the user to adjust the settings of the camera to affect the video motion detection sensitivity, video brightness and contrast, as well as the image area of surveillance for permitting intentional influencing of the reduction of visual clarity of the obtained data when the data is displayed on screen for viewing, thus the visual clarity of the second data is reduced). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Hart and Ramirez-Diaz, as a whole, for remote monitoring of surveillance image data implemented on industrial, medical, remote and home applications (Ramirez-Diaz col.3, ln.49-52).

Regarding claim 37, Hart discloses transferring data from one location to a remote location (col.7, ln.59-66; element 76 is used to distribute or provide data to a remote location). Hart does not disclose wherein said act of processing to produce second data having reduced visual clarity comprises processing to reducing the resolution of video generated from said second data sufficiently that the privacy of

individuals disposed at said first location is protected before said second data is transmitted from said sensor assembly to another location. However, Ramirez-Diaz teaches having reduced visual clarity comprises processing to reducing the resolution of video generated (col.6, ln.55 to col.7, ln.6, fig.2, Ramirez-Diaz discloses the resizing of image data when displaying image data, and also, Ramirez-Diaz permits the user to adjust the settings of the camera to affect the video motion detection sensitivity, video brightness and contrast, as well as the image area of surveillance for permitting intentional influencing of the reduction of visual clarity of the obtained data when the data is displayed on screen for viewing, thus the visual clarity of the second data is reduced) from the second data sufficiently that the privacy of individuals disposed at the first location is protected before the second data is transmitted from the sensor assembly to another location (col.3, ln.41-44, Ramirez-Diaz discloses that the obtained image data can be encrypted for securing the obtained data and maintaining the authenticity and preventing unauthorized access to important surveillance data and protecting the privacy of individuals from the monitored location before transmission to the remote location). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Hart and Ramirez-Diaz, as a whole, for remote monitoring of surveillance image data implemented on industrial, medical, remote and home applications (Ramirez-Diaz col.3, ln.49-52).

Claims 33 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hart (5,473,368).

Regarding claim 33, Hart discloses a remote security monitoring system, comprising:

sensors disposed at one or more locations to be monitored (col.6, ln.17-24, fig.1-2, element 22);

at least one processing entity in operative communication with said sensors and adapted to process raw data from the sensors to produce processed data, said processed data having at least one desired attribute not present in said raw data (col.6, ln.43-46, fig.1-2, element 14, where fig.3 is the interior of element 14, and that element 52 is the processing unit that is in communication with the sensor 22 and PIR sensors 12);

at least one remote monitoring entity adapted to utilize the processed data (col.7, ln.59-66; element 76 is used to distribute or provide data to a remote location); and

a network interface adapted to transfer said processed data from said processing entity to said remote entity (col.7, ln.64-66, fig.3, element 76).

Although Hart does not specifically disclose the processing entity is located within the sensors, however, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include the processing entity within the sensor for interactively connecting with the sensors for obtaining relevant detected data of the monitored scene so as to permit processing captured raw data and permit the accurate, clear display and presentation of the monitored scene. Doing so would provide good clear surveillance of the monitored scene for detecting intruders and suspicious activity.

Claims 23 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hart (5,473,368) in view of Arbuckle (6,637,952).

Regarding claim 23, Hart discloses a quick-change, low-cost sensor assembly adapted to permit removal of a sensor and replacement with another identical or different sensor, comprising:

a sensor element having: (i) a low-cost molded sensor housing (col.6, ln.17-24, fig.1-2, element 22); and

(ii) at least one low-cost sensor disposed at least partly within said housing (col.6, ln.2-10; Hart discloses that the apparatus can be configured by using element 8 to cover the camera 22 in a covert, secretive manner); and (iii) at least one first electrical interface adapted to transmit electrical power and information signals to and from said at least one sensor (fig.1-2, element 80, and fig.3, element 76, col.7, ln.59-66).

Hart does not specifically disclose a support element adapted to support and removably mate with said sensor element, said support element comprising at least one second electrical interface adapted to transmit electrical power and information signals to and from said at least one first interface; and wherein said at least one first and second electrical interfaces are adapted for rapid separation from each other incident with said removal of said sensor element from said support element. Arbuckle teaches a support element adapted to support and removably mate with the sensor element, the support element comprising at least one second electrical interface adapted to transmit electrical power and information signals to and from the at least

Art Unit: 2621

one first interface (col.5, ln.15-22, Arbuckle discloses the support element; col.5, ln.4-14 and col.6, ln.66 to col.7, ln.5), and wherein said at least one first and second electrical interfaces are adapted for rapid separation from each other incident with said removal of said sensor element from said support element (col.5, ln.4-14 and col.6, ln.66 to col.7, ln.5).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Hart and Arbuckle, as a whole, for protecting the vital camera components, jacks and wires while permitting ease of use and installation of cameras for monitoring locations in surveillance tasks (Arbuckle col.2, ln.52-59).

Regarding claim 24, Hart discloses a quick-change, covert sensor assembly, comprising:

a sensor element having: (i) at least one optical sensor (col.6, ln.17-24, fig.1-2, element 22); and

(ii) at least one first electrical interface adapted to transmit electrical power and information signals to and from said at least one sensor (fig.1-2, element 80 and fig.3, element 76, col.7, ln.59-66); and

wherein said sensor assembly is adapted to appear as a non-visual sensor in order to deceive individuals for which optical monitoring is desired (col.6, ln.2-10; Hart discloses that the apparatus can be configured by using element 8 to cover the camera 22 in a covert, secretive manner to make the camera not readily discernable by people in the location so as to blend in with the environment of the monitored location and to prevent the discovery of the camera 22).

Hart does not specifically disclose a support element adapted to support and removably mate with said sensor element, said support element comprising at least one second electrical interface adapted to transmit electrical power and information signals to and from said at least one first interface, and wherein said at least one first and second electrical interfaces are adapted for rapid separation from each other incident with said removal of said sensor element from said support element. However, Arbuckle teaches the support element adapted to support and removably mate with the sensor element, the support element comprising at least one second electrical interface adapted to transmit electrical power and information signals to and from the at least one first interface (col.5, ln.15-22, Arbuckle discloses the support element; col.5, ln.4-14 and col.6, ln.66 to col.7, ln.5), and wherein said at least one first and second electrical interfaces are adapted for rapid separation from each other incident with said removal of said sensor element from said support element (col.5, ln.4-14 and col.6, ln.66 to col.7, ln.5).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Hart and Arbuckle, as a whole, for protecting the vital camera components, jacks and wires while permitting ease of use and installation of cameras for monitoring locations in surveillance tasks (Arbuckle col.2, ln.52-59).

### ***Conclusion***

5. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

***Contact Information***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Allen Wong whose telephone number is (571) 272-7341. The examiner can normally be reached on Mondays to Thursdays from 8am-6pm Flextime.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John W. Miller can be reached on (571) 272-7353. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2621

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Allen Wong/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2621

/Allen Wong/  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 2621

AW  
5/13/08